

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/509,573	XIAO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tiffany A. Fetzner	2859	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Amended

 (1) Tiffany A. Fetzner.

(3) _____.

 (2) Attorney Jay M. Finkelstein Reg. No. 21,082.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: January 19th 2006
Time: 10:00am
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

Claims 6-9

Prior art documents discussed:

None
Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's representative because there were many formal matters still needing to be resolved from the November 8th 2005 amendment and response. There were drawing issues, numerous typographical and grammatical problems, intended use / antecedece issues in amended claims 6-9, and unresolved abstract issues. The attorney agreed to work with the examiner, and gave the examiner permission to address all of the formentioned issues by examiner amendment. The attorney also agreed to submit a new figure 3 as specified in the examiner's amendment to the drawings, so that the novelty of applicant's invention over the prior art could be clearly provided by the three-dimensional view of the new figure 3, as opposed to the poorly illustrated two-dimensional figures of figure 1 and 2, since figure 3 will be figure 1 and 2 combined in three-dimensions. The examiner was thanked for her efforts in moving the application towards allowance. .